

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 28, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 40-44 are hereby amended; and claims 8-20, 22, 24-27, and 32-35 were previously presently. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification on page 7, lines 14-20. Accordingly, claims 8-20, 22, 24-27, 32-35, and 40-44 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-20, 22, 24-27, 32-35, and 40-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (US 6,212, 067), in view of Lewis et al. (US 5,422,751) and Herron et al. (US 5,196,993). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of at least independent claims 40-44, and requests reconsideration of the same.

The Examiner admits (Office Action 3/38/2007, p.3) that while Nakajima discloses several of the claimed limitations it does not disclose or teach a “front case being made from metal,” and a “display module having a metal frame,” as required by at least claims 40, 41, and 42, or similarly a “bezel including metal and substantially covering a periphery of the display module,” and a “display module having a metal frame,” as required by claims 43 and 44.

In an attempt to overcome these deficiencies in Nakajima, the Examiner cites the disclosures of Herron and Lewis. More specifically the Examiner states, “Heron teaches enclosure (60) of a LCD display apparatus (14), being made from aluminum alloy. . . and Lewis teaches a LCD display module (66) having a metal frame,”(Office Action 3/38/2007, p. 3). The Examiner then draws the conclusion that “[i]t would have been obvious. . . to combine the devices of Nakajima with the front case taught by Herron and the LCD frame taught by Lewis for better EMI shielding effect, since they all teach a LCD display module for a computer.” The Examiner sets forth no reasoning for this combination, nor does he contemplate how the apparent modification of Nakajima, by Herron, and Lewis would result in an electrical connection

between the metal frame, the hinge arm, front case, and the LCD module, enabling the LCD module to be electromagnetically shielded by the front case and grounded through the hinge.

Claims 40, 41, and 42 presently recite that “the metal frame, the hinge arm, the enclosure, the front case, and the liquid crystal display module are all electrically connected, enabling the liquid crystal display module to be electromagnetically shielded by the front case and grounded through the hinge.” Further, claims 43 and 44 now recite the metal frame, the bezel, the hinge arm, the enclosure, and the display module are all electrically connected, enabling the display module to be electromagnetically shielded by the bezel and grounded through the hinge. Applicant maintains that nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, renders obvious the claimed invention.

First regarding Lewis, there is provided a front case or bezel 60 that is positively disclosed as being made of plastic (Lewis, col. 2, line. 57). While Lewis does disclose a metal frame 69, it is located behind the LCD panel and electronics 66, and is taught to provide “greater rigidity” and aids generally in giving the device structural integrity (Lewis, col. 3, lines 45-47). Nowhere in Lewis is it taught or even envisioned that the metal frame may be electrically connected to any of LCD panel, a plastic bezel or the hinge to enable a grounding or electromagnetic shielding. Lewis is wholly deficient in teaching the claimed invention.

The Herron reference discloses a metal front case 60, however, nowhere is it taught that the front case is electrically connected to the LCD module 72, the hinge 104, or a metal frame that would provide a grounding effect or electromagnetic shielding. To the contrary, Herron discloses that the LCD module is electrically isolated from the front case 68. Herron teaches that the LCD module 72 is surrounded by printed circuit boards 76, which are placed in shock mounts 78 and thus received in seats 80, which protect the LCD module 72 from contact with front metal case 68 (Herron, col. 5, lines 8-17). Nowhere in the disclose of Herron is there any indication that the metal front case 68 of housing 60 is provided for any reason other than structural support and/or protection. The only electrical connection discussed by Herron is that of a flexible circuit strip 106 that provides a pathway for electrical signals from the CPU 12 to the display 14. There is no grounding function disclosed in connection with this circuit strip.

As set forth in the May 3, 2007 memo from the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Operations to Technology Center Directors, directing application of the Supreme Courts recent ruling in *KSR International Co., V. Teleflex, Inc.*, No. 04-1350 (U.S. April 30, 2007)...

in formulating a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, it remains necessary to identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed.

As the Supreme Court specifically noted, it is “important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements” as claimed.

Given the above described disclosures of Lewis and Herron, the Examiner purports that by modifying Nakajima with the teachings of these two inventions, one would end up with the claimed invention. The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Nakajima fails to disclose at least the metal front case and metal bezel presently claimed herein. Since Nakajima’s front case is made of a “synthetic resin” (Nakajima, col. 5, lines 19-20), there is clearly a lack of a teaching to electrically connect the front case to any of at least the LCD module or hinge in order to ground the front cover, enabling an electromagnetic shielding effect by the front case. In fact, Nakajima teaches away from this and discloses entirely different grounding system that involves a rear supports 29a and 29b secured to grounding springs 43 that are electrically connected to a conductive layer 14 that is placed behind the LCD panel 11 (Nakajima, FIG, 10B-C). In view of this, Applicant submits that there is no explicit reason that would have prompted one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Nakajima reference with the metal front case of Herron. There is no teaching, and therefore no reason that would have prompted one of ordinary skill in the art, in either Lewis, Herron, or Nakajima to electrically connect the front case to any of either the LCD module, a metal frame, or a hinge in order to create a grounding or electromagnetic shielding effect.

For these reasons Applicants maintain that nothing in Nakajima, Herron, and Lewis, alone or in combination, renders obvious the claimed invention. Applicant requests

reconsideration of the present application and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 8-20, 22, 24-27, 32-35, and 40-44.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: **28 June 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca G. Rudich

Registration No.: **41,786**

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant